

(Mr. MINGE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CASTLE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BATEMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REGARDING STATEMENTS BY CHAIRMAN HYDE OF THE COM- MITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary held a press conference in which he made announcements which I had, until I read the report, known nothing about. There are comments here that I think require us to examine this quite carefully.

First of all, the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) has indicated his intention to vote for an inquiry of impeachment of the President of the United States, quite within his scope of his duties, or any other Member, for that matter. But to suggest that Democrats ought to vote in the committee along with him to show bipartisanship I think stretches the bounds of reasonableness to a breaking point.

Every Member in this body has their own responsibility and inquiry within themselves to determine, especially on the Committee on the Judiciary, whether or not there should be an inquiry.

□ 1930

The fact that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has decided that there should be, should not influence anybody else in this body. For him to suggest that Democrats should show bipartisanship by voting with him is, indeed, an incorrect position which I hope he will repair immediately tomorrow.

I just left his office, and he was not there. The office was closed. But one of his staffers was nice enough to inform me that I am on his schedule to meet with him tomorrow.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) cannot dictate what the Committee on the Judiciary's Members, 21 Republicans and 16 Democrats, are

going to vote a week from now. He cannot do it. Neither can I. Neither can the Speaker.

To announce to the press unilaterally that that vote will take place a week from today begs common sense. We are out until Thursday. There is a weekend of 2 days. We are supposed to come back on Monday, and the most important vote of the Committee on the Judiciary in its recent history is supposed to happen between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. a week from today. I suggest that is an incorrect way to proceed. It is unilateral. I am reading about it.

When by chance does the committee get a chance to examine the materials for something other than looking for redactions to send out to the American people? We still have not finished. Because we sent over staffers to find out that there are even more boxes in the independent counsel's office in which he said he deemed them irrelevant and of no consequence to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Well, thank you, Mr. Starr. But I think that is within our jurisdiction to make the determination whether anything is irrelevant or not. He sent us 37 boxes. Send it all and let us examine it all.

But let us not be deceived. Going through materials for redactions that may contain 6(e) materials, that is Grand Jury materials that are accorded privacy, or that there may be defamatory materials that will harm innocent Americans, or that women's phone numbers and addresses should be redacted is a completely different matter from examining the materials with an eye to whether or not we should have an inquiry of impeachment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE EXPORT ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, fiscal year 1998 ends in 3 days, and President Clinton has let cob webs grow on the Export Enhancement Program.

Yes, as our farmer constituents struggle through one of the most devastating downturns in commodity prices our country has seen, our President has sat on \$150 million that could have been and should have been utilized to prevent the loss of markets in wheat, wheat flour, vegetable oil, and other commodities.

The 1996 farm bill made over \$1.5 billion available for EEP, and this admin-

istration has used it to move some frozen chickens and some barley. They should be ashamed.

This administration's trade policy should be called promises made, promises broken. Understanding the need to open new markets for our commodities, the President has promised to utilize EEP to its fullest. This is a promise he has not kept.

In March of this year, I joined my colleagues from Oklahoma in sending a letter to Secretary Glickman outlining our thoughts on the need for the administration to utilize EEP. I would like to read the letter we sent.

Dear Mr. Secretary: It has come to our attention that according to the United States Department of Agriculture . . . February supply/demand report, the season average price for wheat is expected to decline by at least twenty percent compared to the 1996/97 season. This price decline is causing serious concern to our producers, and we strongly urge the Department to use all discretionary programs to strengthen market prices and export opportunities for U.S. producers.

We believe the Department should aggressively utilize export enhancement tools in strategic markets, including the Export Enhancement Program (EEP) and the GSM credit programs. All agree that export growth is fundamental to improved market prices for producers. As we talk it our producers/constituents throughout Oklahoma, they time and time again express great dissatisfaction with the Department's reluctance to use the EEP to counter competitive subsidization of wheat in world markets. The unwillingness to utilize this program has weakened its effectiveness both as a deterrent to unfair trade practices and as a means of gaining access to markets.

As U.S. producers lose market share to a growing list of countries with state trading enterprises, it is imperative that the Department implement a long-term strategy to counter these entities. As you begin the preparation for the next round of World Trade Organization Negotiations in Agriculture, we hope that you will utilize all export tools available.

Thank you for consideration. We are looking forward to your response. FRANK D. LUCAS, J.C. WATTS, JR., ERNEST ISTOOK, STEVE LARGENT, WES WATKINS, and TOM COBURN.

How did he respond? Nearly \$50 million a month has sat idly by as our markets have dried up throughout the world as the administration plays partisan politics with the future of our producers. I would argue that one of the main problems plaguing those trying to earn a living off this land is this administration's lack of an agricultural trade policy. Mr. President, this needs to change.

SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY WHILE PROVIDING TAX RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to echo everything that my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), just said because that is a very important issue to the farmers and ranchers in my home State of South Dakota.